

REMARKS**STATUS OF CLAIMS**

Claims 1-24 were pending in the application. Claims 1, 4-6, 11, 14-16, 21, 22, and 24 have been amended, claims 3, 7, 13, 17, and 21-24 have been cancelled, while no claims have been added. Therefore, claims 1-2, 4-6, 8-12, 14-16, and 18-20 are pending and are submitted for reconsideration.

OBJECTIONS TO THE CLAIMS

Applicants have amended claims 11 and 16 to address the objections noted in the office action and submit that these claims are now unobjectionable.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC §112

In the office action, claims 1, 5, 6, 10, 11, 15, 20, 21, and 24 were rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph as being indefinite. With respect to the issues noted by the examiner applicants have amended the claims to clarify the antecedent basis for the active application in claims 5 and 12 (and claim 24 has been cancelled). Applicants have also amended the independent claims to clarify that the phonetic input represents text input that corresponds to the sounds of the recited alphabets and is consistent with the definition of transliteration provided by the examiner in the office action and its definition in the specification. See, for example, paragraph [36] of the specification.

REJECTION UNDER 35 USC §101

In the office action, claims 11, 16 (presumably), and 21 are rejected under section 101 for including the carrier waves. While the issue of the patentability of signal claims is legally unresolved pending the decision in the *In re Nuijten* case at the Federal Circuit, applicants have amended the claims in accordance with the current PTO guidelines in order to expedite the prosecution of the case.

Type of Response: Amendment
Application Number: 10/777,154
Attorney Docket Number: 316213.01
Filing Date: February 13, 2004

PRIOR ART REJECTIONS

In the office action, claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,432,948 (“Davis”) in view of the article “An Interactive Translation Support facility for non-Professional Users” ANLP 1997 (hereafter “Yamabana”). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, receiving phonetic text input in a first alphabet of a first language intended as input for an active application executing on the computing device, wherein an input mode of the active application is set to a second language;

hooking the phonetic text input;

converting the phonetic text input to the second language that uses a second alphabet, said converting based on a mapping scheme; and

passing the converted phonetic input to an active application executing on the computing device,

wherein the hooking step occurs at the system wide level.

Several of these recited features are not disclosed or suggested by the applied references. Specifically, none of the applied references teach or suggest receiving phonetic text input in a first alphabet of a first language intended as input for an active application executing on the computing device, wherein an input mode of the active application is set to a second language and where the phonetic text input is hooked at a system wide level.

Therefore, these recited features provide the advantage that an input mode of an active application can be set to a second language while phonetic text input is received in a first alphabet of a first language and moreover this automatic hooking and conversion is

Type of Response: Amendment
Application Number: 10/777,154
Attorney Docket Number: 316213.01
Filing Date: February 13, 2004

performed at a system wide level. See, for example, paragraphs 41 and 42 for support for these recited features.

Specifically, Davis discloses a rule based text input transliteration system in which transliterators are desktop objects that have to be activated by a user. See col. 4, lines 55-56. Furthermore, as acknowledged in the office action, Davis does not disclose the recited system wide hooking (or any hooking at all) because Davis is not designed to be used at the system wide level to provide automatic transliteration based on the input mode of an active application. The office action relies on Yamabani for disclosing a hooking process in which a language conversion front-end (for *translation*) may be inserted between a keyboard and an application in the dataflow. See page 329 of Yamabani. However, this insertion taught by Yamabani relates to insertion between the keyboard and one or more applications at an application by application level and does not teach a system wide hooking step recited in independent claim 1.

Therefore, while Yamabani teaches the use of hooking for *translation* it does not teach the system wide hooking recited in independent claim 1 and nor does it relate to transliteration in any way. Furthermore, even Yamabani does not teach that the hooking and transliteration is performed automatically based on the input mode of an active application. Therefore, neither of the references nor their reasonable combination disclose or suggest the recited feature of receiving phonetic text input in a first alphabet of a first language intended as input for an active application executing on the computing device, wherein an input mode of the active application is set to a second language and where the phonetic text input is hooked at a system wide level. That is, even if Davis and Yamabani were properly combinable they would only disclose a user activated transliteration process (shown by Davis) with a hooking setup disclosed by Yamabani by which a language conversion front-end (for translation) may be inserted between a keyboard and one or more specific applications. Therefore, this applied combination does not disclose the recited features in independent claim 1 and neither do they provide

Type of Response: Amendment
Application Number: 10/777,154
Attorney Docket Number: 316213.01
Filing Date: February 13, 2004

the feature of the automatic transliteration at a system wide level as provided by the features recited in claim 1.

Independent claim 11 also recites features that are very similar to that discussed above with respect to claim 1 and is also patentable for similar reasons.

Independent claims 6 and 16 recites, *inter alia*, **receiving a text string in a first alphabet of a** first language on an input of the computing device; converting the text string **to a phonetic string in a second alphabet**, based on a first predefined phonetic mapping scheme between the first alphabet and the second alphabet; **converting the phonetic string into a third alphabet of a second language**, based on a second predefined phonetic mapping scheme between the second alphabet and the third alphabet; and

displaying a system-level menu bar with menu items, the menu items including an option to transliterate the text string, wherein the converting steps are initiated by selecting the transliterate option.

Several of these recited features are not disclosed or suggested by the applied references. Specifically, none of the applied references disclose or suggest the transliteration between a phonetic input in a first alphabet to a third alphabet while using respective mappings between first and third alphabets and a pivot second alphabet. With respect to these features, the office action cites to col. 3, line 65 to col. 4, line 3 of Davis. However, this portion of Davis simply discloses that transcription from one language to another may be ambiguous. To resolve this ambiguity, Davis proposes context sensitive transcription rules. In fact, Davis teaches that transliteration between three alphabets (as recited in the pending claims 6 and 16) would not work because of these ambiguities. See also col. 4, lines 18-22 where Davis states that any such attempt would be doomed to failure.

Therefore, the disclosure of Davis actually teaches away from the features recited in independent claims 6 and 16. Nor is this deficiency of Davis cured by Yamabani.

Type of Response: Amendment
Application Number: 10/777,154
Attorney Docket Number: 316213.01
Filing Date: February 13, 2004

Accordingly, the office action fails to make a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to independent claims 6 and 16.

DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The dependent claims are deemed to be patentable at least based on their dependence from allowable independent claims. In addition, they recite patentable subject matter when considered as a whole.

It should be noted that applicants have not separately argued the patentability of each of the dependent claims in view of the patentability of the independent claim from which they ultimately depend. However, applicants reserve the right to distinguish these claims over the presently applied reference and do not acquiesce in the currently applied rejections in view of the clear deficiencies of the applied reference with respect to the independent claim 1 as discussed earlier herein.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, applicants submit that the application is now in condition for allowance and an indication of the same is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the Applicants' representative at the telephone number listed below.

Type of Response: Amendment
Application Number: 10/777,154
Attorney Docket Number: 316213.01
Filing Date: February 13, 2004

If this Amendment is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicant hereby requests any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this Response, including an extension fee that is not covered by an enclosed check please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-0463.

Respectfully submitted,
Microsoft Corporation

Date: September 7, 2007

By: /Aaron C. Chatterjee/

Aaron C. Chatterjee
Reg. No. 41,398
Attorney for Applicants
Direct telephone (703) 647-6572
Microsoft Corporation
One Microsoft Way
Redmond WA 98052-6399

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION
(Under 37 CFR § 1.8(a)) or ELECTRONIC FILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically deposited with the USPTO via EFS-Web on the date shown below:

September 7, 2007
Date

/Kate Marochkina/
Signature

Kate Marochkina
Printed Name

Type of Response: Amendment
Application Number: 10/777,154
Attorney Docket Number: 316213.01
Filing Date: February 13, 2004